

its passage. Why do you want to agitate it? We do not care particularly about the agitation, but object to your haggling in such doctrines as these promulgated to-day. [Laughter.] When you ask us to pronounce a finality upon such sentiments, we shall not do it.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1852.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN.

Copies of this work are for sale at the office of the *National Era*, on 7th street. Price—in paper covers, \$1; cloth, \$1.50; cloth, full gilt, \$2.

Persons at a distance of not over 500 miles may have this work in paper covers mailed to them, *free of postage*, on addressing L. Clephane, at this office, and enclosing \$1 in money and 27 cents in post office stamps—over 500 miles the postage will be 54 cents.

"THE ISSUE"—THE MISSION OF THE DEMOCRACY.

The Washington *Union*, until lately, was so moderate in its discussion of the Slavery Question, that the *Southern Press* was constantly upbraiding it with disloyalty to Slaveholding interests. At the Presidential campaign drew near, and the indications became manifest that the Anti-Slavery section of the Democratic Party at the North did not intend to urge its views to the point of a disruption of party relations, the "organ" began to give a more distinct sound. It boldly insisted upon the reaffirmation of the Compromise and Fugitive Law, in their totality and finality, as a part of the Democratic platform. In this course it was sustained by the tacit acquiescence of nearly all the Free-Soul Democratic members of Congress, by the indecisive tone (with a single exception) of the few who at first proclaimed adverse opinions, and by the Compromise resolutions carried through the House by a majority of the Democratic members. Then followed the famous correspondence of the Eleven, accepting and ratifying the Totality and Finality test. This elicited the *Union* beyond all bounds, and its editor, fondly trusting that the whole Party had at last become soundly converted in the faith of the peculiar institution, took occasion on the Sabbath after the appearance of the correspondence, to deliver a Biblical Lecture on Slavery, in which he took the ground that, in the light of Divine truth, the Anti-Slavery movement was a sin, and Slavery a "patriarchal system," sanctioned by Moses and all the prophets, and also the luminaries of the Christian Dispensation. In his opinion, it seems the platform of the Democracy should be theological as well as political, that with the Bible, added to the Compromise, the Constitution, the Baltimore Platform and the resolutions of '98, its foundations must endure forever.

Having thus defined the religious as well as political creed of the Party, it proceeded in subsequent numbers to argue that the main issue of the coming struggle was, *Slavery versus Anti-Slavery*. Here is one specimen of the way in which he refers to the subject:

"In an absolute and excellent regard to all points of difference between the two parties, a brief examination of the main issue before the country, and an inquiry into the relations which those parties respectively bear towards it, would not seem at the present moment inappropriate or ill timed.

* * * * *

"Anti-Slavery agitation is to be continued—continued, too, in defiance of each one and all the interests of the country, in opposition to sentiments political or purely patriotic—carried on and carried out without regard to consequences, and with the most unfeeling and most appalling. Mark, too, the extent to which the designs thus announced are made to reach. Anti-Slavery agitation is no longer to be confined to purposes of excluding the South from the Territories, ruling out the admission of more slave States to the Union, and abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. The termination of its existence in the country is the end of the Republic—an end which no sane man can contemplate without being conscious that it would be the end of the Constitution—the end of the Republic."

"This, then, is the issue. Shall agitation for such an end be permitted—shall *Anti-Slavery agitation in any shape be any longer tolerated?* For to the same result it would lead, no matter what the professed purpose of those who commence it or continue it. One would suppose that to such a question the American people would find no difficulty in returning a speedy and decided answer."

The end of Slavery, he holds, would be "the end of the Constitution—the end of the Republic." He is entirely too modest. Having proved that the system is "patriarchal," identified with the Bible as much as with the Constitution, we submit that his climax halts. It should read: The end of Slavery would be the end of the Constitution, the end of the Republic, nay, the end of Religion itself!

Now, "Anti-Slavery agitation in any shape" would "lead to the same result"—the three-fold result. The issue, then, is, "Shall agitation for such an end be permitted—shall Anti-Slavery agitation in any shape be any longer tolerated?" No matter what the professed purpose of those who commence or continue it; no matter what the professed purpose of those who commence it or continue it. One would suppose that to such a question the American people would find no difficulty in returning a speedy and decided answer."

The end of Slavery, he holds, would be "the end of the Constitution—the end of the Republic." He is entirely too modest. Having proved that the system is "patriarchal," identified with the Bible as much as with the Constitution, we submit that his climax halts. It should read: The end of Slavery would be the end of the Constitution, the end of the Republic, nay, the end of Religion itself!

The Convention then proceeded to ballot for a Presidential candidate; no one received a vote who had not pledged his veto in advance upon any act of Congress for the repeal or modification of the Fugitive Slave Law. This fact shows the complete apostasy of the Radical Democrats of the North to represent their views and principles. At last, wearied by unsuccessful efforts to choose from this consecrated band, it passed them all by, and settled almost unanimously upon FRANKLIN PIERCE, of New Hampshire, a Hunker of Hunkers, professedly loyal to Slavery, from whom no word or vote in behalf of Human Rights has ever been recorded, who has avowed his entire devotion to the Compromise, but who, in the absence of any award, could be better trusted by the Slaveholding Interest than a majority of the candidates for whom it had voted.

Then followed the almost unanimous nomination for the Vice Presidency of William R. King, of Alabama, a thorough-going devotee of Slavery in the Calhoun school, and who, in his letter to Scott, invested the Fugitive Law with the sacredness of the Constitution.

Finally, leaving nothing to uncertainty, it passed the candidates under bonds, by the adoption of the old resolution on Slavery, by falsely asserting that that resolution overrode the adjustment measures of the last Congress, by adopting the finality and totality test, and by passing a special resolution pledging the Democratic party "to resist all attempts at renewing in Congress and out of it the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color the attempt might be made"—a high-handed, atrocious effort on the part of a popular Convention to put down all freedom of debate in Congress—to thrust a gag in the throats of the People's Representatives.

These resolutions were reported, read twice amidst deafening cries, the extra delegates and spectators by their clamor drowning the voice of dissent; the previous question was sustained; a separate vote was denied on each resolution; there was not spirit enough among the fair-minded members to demand a vote by States; the whole, cumbersome, abominable batch was voted at once, and without investigation! We use the word "abominable" in sole reference to the Slavery portion of the resolutions.

And now, the Democracy of the United States is called upon to ratify the doings of this Convention, to elect its nominees to the highest offices of the Republic, and to make these resolve the basis of Administrative policy for the next four years!

We congratulate the Democracy upon its high vocation. With Moses and the Prophets, and the Apostles, and the Fathers of the Democratic church, and the holy Eleven, with the Bible in one hand and the Constitution in the other, bearing in tokens of light on its broad phylacteries the resolutions of '98, the Baltimore resolves, the Compromise, and the Fugitive

Law—who can doubt the glorious results? Of course, Anti-Slavery agitation will be put down, and Democracy and Slavery reign together in perpetual harmony and peace! And what a beautiful sight it will be, to see the erring Democrats from the North, who for a little while went astray after the false god of Liberty, now rejoicing the elect host, and participating in the millennial beatitudes of the new dispensation!

Seriously, we think the Washington *Union* is presuming too much on the pliability of our Northern friends. There are at least a few liberal Democrats of the North who cannot be persuaded that either profit or honor to be gained by enlisting under the banner of the Slave Power in a crusade against the prevailing sentiment of their own section. They cannot be persuaded to support a candidate standing upon the sublime issue expounded by the *Union*.

"THE ISSUE"—THE MISSION OF THE DEMOCRACY.

The Washington *Union*, until lately, was so moderate in its discussion of the Slavery Question, that the *Southern Press* was constantly upbraiding it with disloyalty to Slaveholding interests. At the Presidential campaign drew near, and the indications became manifest that the Anti-Slavery section of the Democratic Party at the North did not intend to urge its views to the point of a disruption of party relations, the "organ" began to give a more distinct sound. It boldly insisted upon the reaffirmation of the Compromise and Fugitive Law, in their totality and finality, as a part of the Democratic platform. In this course it was sustained by the tacit acquiescence of nearly all the Free-Soul Democratic members of Congress, by the indecisive tone (with a single exception) of the few who at first proclaimed adverse opinions, and by the Compromise resolutions carried through the House by a majority of the Democratic members. Then followed the famous correspondence of the Eleven, accepting and ratifying the Totality and Finality test. This elicited the *Union* beyond all bounds, and its editor, fondly trusting that the whole Party had at last become soundly converted in the faith of the peculiar institution, took occasion on the Sabbath after the appearance of the correspondence, to deliver a Biblical Lecture on Slavery, in which he took the ground that, in the light of Divine truth, the Anti-Slavery movement was a sin, and Slavery a "patriarchal system," sanctioned by Moses and all the prophets, and also the luminaries of the Christian Dispensation. In his opinion, it seems the platform of the Democracy should be theological as well as political, that with the Bible, added to the Compromise, the Constitution, the Baltimore Platform and the resolutions of '98, its foundations must endure forever.

The rules of the House of Representatives were adopted, by which it was easy to exclude freedom of debate.

While the free States generally sent only the number of delegates to which they were entitled, several of the Slave States were represented by scores of delegates who by the pressure of numerical force, by acclamations or hisses, as the case might demand, could control the Convention, except when the vote could be taken by States. Virginia had more than a hundred representatives, while Ohio had but her voting number, twenty-three. The whole atmosphere of the Convention was saturated with Hunkerism.

Some weeks ago, Mr. Polk of Tennessee, the House announced to Mr. Rantoul of Massachusetts, that he would be thrust out of the party. The Convention made good the prediction. Mr. Rantoul, in position, talents, and labor, has been at the head of the New England Democracy. By a Democratic Convention regularly called in his district, he was nominated a delegate to the National Convention at Baltimore, by an overwhelming majority. A few dissatisfied Hunkers bolted, held a kind of convention of some thirty persons opposed to his nomination, and nominated Mr. Lord. Mr. Rantoul was also nominated for Congress by a regularly authorized Convention of the Democracy, the Old Line Democracy of the district. Mr. Lord was nominated by a few Hunker bolters. On the 7th April, 1851, the People decided the contest, by giving Rantoul 3,151 votes and Lord 48! At the Convention, Mr. Rantoul, on strength of his party, was elected to the position of chairman, and then all you can for his election, so as to make his Principles operative and controlling! Denounces as atrocious the main issue on which he demands your votes, and then stamp that issue as right, or yourselves as the perpetrators of an atrocious wrong, by acceding to his demand.

Mr. Pierce, in accepting the nomination of the Convention, is bound by its Declaration of Principles, its Pledges, its Issues. In himself he represents all these. His election is sought with a view to the establishment of these Principles, the fulfillment of these Pledges, the triumph of these Issues. Protest so much as you please, your vote cast for him, makes you responsible in all these particulars. If a candidate and the organization he represents make the main issue of an election, Anti-Slavery agitation or discussion, pledging themselves, if successful, to its suppression, every vote given for them is a vote against agitation, against discussion—a vote to provide means for their suppression. Your vote is an act—your protest, when you do protest, ought not to be done.

What kind of a position will you hold before the public? To promote the success of the nomination to which you pledge yourself, you must crush all your sympathies for Humanity. How would discussion of the Slavery Question help a candidate pledged against it? How would an exposure of the dark plot to smuggle Slavery into California help a candidate who, if elected, would give it aid and countenance? How would the denunciation of the inhuman operation of the Fugitive Slave Law, in some new and startling case, contribute to the election of a candidate bound to resist all attempts to mitigate the law? The case was referred to the Committee on Credentials, (Hunker,) appointed by the President of the Convention, (a Hunker.) The Committee (excepting Mr. Ny) coolly reported in favor of Mr. Lord; Romulus M. Saunders, of North Carolina, demanded the previous question on the adoption of the report, so as to prevent the fact of the case from coming to the knowledge of the members; and the Convention, voting by States, adopted it—years 1968. General Ny of New York moved a reconsideration, made a serious appeal in behalf of justice to Rantoul and the Democracy of his district, at the close of which, on motion of Cave Johnson of Tennessee, the motion to reconsider, without further opportunity for debate, was laid upon the table. So the Convention, without deliberation, instigated by Hunkerism, voted Rantoul out of his seat, and the three thousand Democrats of his district who voted for him, and the thousands of Democrats in New England who sympathized with him, out of the party. Reason: Mr. Rantoul and they held to the doctrine of Non-Intervention by the Federal Government with Slavery and the Extradition of Slaves—which, in the judgment of Hunkerism and its Master, is "a damnable heresy."

The Convention then proceeded to ballot for a Presidential candidate; no one received a vote who had not pledged his veto in advance upon any act of Congress for the repeal or modification of the Fugitive Slave Law. This fact shows the complete apostasy of the Radical Democrats of the North to represent their views and principles. At last, wearied by unsuccessful efforts to choose from this consecrated band, it passed them all by, and settled almost unanimously upon FRANKLIN PIERCE, of New Hampshire, a Hunker of Hunkers, professedly loyal to Slavery, from whom no word or vote in behalf of Human Rights has ever been recorded, who has avowed his entire devotion to the Compromise, but who, in the absence of any award, could be better trusted by the Slaveholding Interest than a majority of the candidates for whom it had voted.

Then followed the almost unanimous nomination for the Vice Presidency of William R. King, of Alabama, a thorough-going devotee of Slavery in the Calhoun school, and who, in his letter to Scott, invested the Fugitive Law with the sacredness of the Constitution.

Finally, leaving nothing to uncertainty, it passed the candidates under bonds, by the adoption of the old resolution on Slavery, by falsely asserting that that resolution overrode the adjustment measures of the last Congress, by adopting the finality and totality test, and by passing a special resolution pledging the Democratic party "to resist all attempts at renewing in Congress and out of it the agitation of the Slavery Question, under whatever shape or color the attempt might be made"—a high-handed, atrocious effort on the part of a popular Convention to put down all freedom of debate in Congress—to thrust a gag in the throats of the People's Representatives.

These resolutions were reported, read twice amidst deafening cries, the extra delegates and spectators by their clamor drowning the voice of dissent; the previous question was sustained; a separate vote was denied on each resolution; there was not spirit enough among the fair-minded members to demand a vote by States; the whole, cumbersome, abominable batch was voted at once, and without investigation! We use the word "abominable" in sole reference to the Slavery portion of the resolutions.

And now, the Democracy of the United States is called upon to ratify the doings of this Convention, to elect its nominees to the highest offices of the Republic, and to make these resolve the basis of Administrative policy for the next four years!

We congratulate the Democracy upon its

If this nomination prove successful, we shall expect to see California divided, and its southern portion erected into a Slave State—a favorite scheme of the Slave Power, and for the consummation of which it is necessary to secure a favorable Administration. Every barrier to the introduction of Slavery into the Territories would be thrown down: freedom there is in jeopardy, with an Administration in Washington that regards the Constitution of the United States as carrying with it the right to hold slaves in whatever territory may be acquired by the United States. This is the doctrine insisted upon by that great interest which dictated the nomination, and by the school of politicians to which Mr. Pierce belongs. Nor must we forget that the policy of the annexation of Cuba, and of further acquisitions of territory, the *Whig* party, is yet cherished in the South, and will be urged whenever circumstances may seem auspicious. Who doubts that in General Pierce the advocates of this policy will find their most efficient instrument?

And then, by the resolves of the Convention, he and his Party are bound to regard the Adjustment measures, in their totality, as a final settlement of the Slavery Question, so far as agitation against Slavery is concerned, and to resist all attempts to renew this agitation, "in Congress or out of it." This is a proclamation of war against Free Discussion—it is the old gag policy once attempted to be enforced by the Pinckneys and Pattons of other days.

A burden which came near breaking the back of the Democracy two years ago, is again fastened upon it. Once more the Democratic Party of the North is to be dedicated to the suicidal task of conquering the Northern People, and making them the bondmen of the Slaveholding Power.

Will the Van Buren Democrats of 1848 submit to such a consecration as this? Will they yield to this crusade against the peculiar, cherished sentiments of the North—this flagrant war against the Freedom of Speech and of the Press?

But, they will support the nomination, and protest against the platform! Aye—proclaim war against the Principles of your candidate, and then do all you can for his election, so as to make his Principles operative and controlling! Denounces as atrocious the main issue on which he demands your votes, and then stamp that issue as right, or yourselves as the perpetrators of an atrocious wrong, by acceding to his demand.

The ERA AND THE POSTMASTERS.—General

Mr. Pierce, in accepting the nomination of the Convention, is bound by its Declaration of Principles, its Pledges, its Issues.

He represents all these. His election is sought with a view to the establishment of these Principles, the fulfillment of these Pledges, the triumph of these Issues. Protest so much as you please, your vote cast for him, makes you responsible in all these particulars.

But, they will support the nomination, and protest against the platform! Aye—proclaim war against the Principles of your candidate, and then do all you can for his election, so as to make his Principles operative and controlling! Denounces as atrocious the main issue on which he demands your votes, and then stamp that issue as right, or yourselves as the perpetrators of an atrocious wrong, by acceding to his demand.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.—A word to the writer of the proposition that this head on our fourth page. You have no right to place the *Era* in the category of those who are in the habit of wrangling with each other about modes of policy. No facts warrant this classification.

The *Era* assails no one for a difference of opinion, unless that difference involves a question of Principle, and its assault is then justified on any calculation of consequences, any plea of Party necessity. The philosophy of our friends of the *Era* conducts them to different conclusions. With such a philosophy, how long before they can hope to redeem their Party from thraldom to Slavery?

CONGRESS.

The *National Intelligencer* of yesterday, says of the proceedings of the present Congress:

"It is related by Bacon, that once, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth of England, when Parliament was sat, long, and the House of Commons were in session, the Speaker of the House of Commons, who had been sent by the Queen to speak to the Queen, she said to him, 'Now, Mr. Speaker, what has passed in your House?' To which the Speaker replied, 'If it please your Majesty, seven weeks.'

"If our sovereign (the People) of the United States could be supposed bodily to address the same question to Mr. Speaker Boyd, of our House of Representatives, what much more satisfactory reply than this could the Speaker make, substituting six months for seven weeks?"

"However little this may done during the last six weeks, it is done something will be done during the next week. Congress has already adjourned over to Friday; if the Baltimore Convention should have completed its work for that time, the minds of members will be so much occupied with the result, that no other topic has a chance of receiving any attention in Congress, for the rest of the week, at least. If the proceedings of the Convention should be drawn out beyond Thursday, Congress might as well adjourn at once, till Monday, as it would be in the power of the Speaker to call a question for debate.

"When the *Whig* Convention is over, Congress must have a holiday of another week."

"The two candidates for the Presidency are nominated, the warfare, which before was a series of skirmishes, becomes a general engagement: the struggles of different districts of the same party for the ascendancy are over; the two great parties are mastered against each other with an appearance of unanimity, and the contest is hard to stand. The day allows for the transaction of business, and the question of the Presidential question will be made till each member has fairly unburdened himself, and sent home the desired quantity of speeches to be read by his constituents; and then the members are tired of Washington and of each other; a few days, just as the two Houses are about to adjourn, will be set apart for the transaction of necessary business, which will be hurried through without due consideration, and of which a considerable part must, of course, be ill done.

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

There was a time when the radical Democrats of New York attached vital importance to the resolutions or creed promulgated by their State Conventions. They would not object to Hunker candidates provided the platform to the election of a candidate bound to resist all attempts to mitigate the law to prevent the fact of the case from coming to the knowledge of the members; and the Convention, voting by States, adopted it.

Presently their opinions underwent a change, and when the re-union took place in New York, on the basis of Hunker resolutions, O! then, resolutions all at once became quite unimportant—they but expressed the opinion of individual members of the convention—the great thing was the ticket—the great thing on that were radical Democrats—nearly half each unburdened himself, and sent home the desired quantity of speeches to be read by his constituents; and then the members are tired of Washington and of each other; a few days, just as the two Houses are about to adjourn, will be set apart for the transaction of necessary business, which will be hurried through without due consideration, and of which a considerable part must, of course, be ill done.

THE VALUE OF RESOLUTIONS.

There was a time when the radical Democrats of New York attached vital importance to the resolutions or creed promulgated by their State Conventions. They would not object to Hunker candidates provided the platform to the election of a candidate bound to resist all attempts to mitigate the law to prevent the fact of the case from coming to the knowledge of the members; and the Convention, voting by States, adopted it.

Presently their opinions underwent a change, and when the re-union took place in New York, on the basis of Hunker resolutions, O! then, resolutions all at once became quite unimportant—they but expressed the opinion of individual members of the convention—the great thing was the ticket—the great thing on that were radical Democrats—nearly half each unburdened himself, and sent home the desired quantity of speeches to be read by his constituents; and then the members are tired of Washington and of each other; a few days, just as the two Houses are about to adjourn, will be set apart for the transaction of necessary business, which will be hurried through without due consideration, and of which a considerable part must, of course, be ill done.

THE NEW YORK EVENING POST.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

To the Editor of the *National Era*:

DEAR SIR: I send you herewith a sketch of an Anti-Slavery League on a new plan, which I wish to have published in your paper, for the consideration of leading Anti-Slavery men throughout the United States. I have stated this plan in conversation with individuals, and have found many who highly approved of it, and wished it to be brought before the public. I then sent it to the following in the state-mast in in concise a form as was consistent with making its principal feature intelligible. I should be glad to hear through your paper the opinions of the judicious concerning it, whether in approval or in criticism and objections. Yours very truly,

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.
Meadville, Western Penn., May, 1852.

PROPOSALS FOR THE FORMATION OF A NEW ANTI-SLAVERY ASSOCIATION.

The present condition of the Anti-Slavery cause in the United States seems to indicate that some new and general effort is needed in order to give concentration, union, and aim, to the existing convictions of the friends of Freedom. During the last two years we have seen a vast conspiracy against the rights of man formed and carried forward by the union of political parties and leaders, primarily to subserve their own interests. The leaders of the Whig and Democratic parties at the North have united with the Slave Power to give to Slavery new guarantees and securities. We have seen Clay and Cass, Webster and Buchanan, Fillmore and Foote, working together, and eulogizing each other. We have seen the patronage and power of a Northern Whig President put forth to nullify all opposition to these compromises with evil. We have seen the greatest intellect of the land prostituted to the task of making concessions, many despises and sacrifices, and many compromises. We have seen the respectable journals of the North forgetting their ancient gentility in their rage against the men who stood up for the law of God. And we have seen great multitudes of well-meaning but soft-minded people persuaded that this effort was all necessary to save the Union from some supposed danger. The result has been that apostasy from the cause of Freedom have been made. But still, the vast majority of the land and great multitudes of the people of the Law of God and the rights of man. Now the question comes, how shall they take advantage of the coming reaction, and so organize their efforts as to do the most service in the cause of Freedom?

These movements have hitherto included nearly all of Anti-Slavery effort—the first exclusively moral, the second partly moral and partly political, the third mostly political. The first is the original Garrisonian movement, which is still continued, which was born in the Free Soil Party in 1848, at Buffalo.

The third is the Free Soil Party. This last is a political party, with its regular nominations and newspapers, and with the machinery and policy of a political party.

All these movements have done good—all are doing good—but all, we believe, are deficient. To William Lloyd Garrison, and his friends will ever belong the merit of awakening the public mind to the guilt of slaveholding, and the duty of emancipation. They proclaim the Law and the End—their motto is, "The Law is the end." The Liberty Party endeavored to be at once a political party and a moral influence—they were too impracticable for the one, too practical for the other. The Free Soil Party is in danger of becoming more and more a mere party—intent on carrying the next election, and losing its high moral prestige. When it maintains this, it does not well as a party. Yet both these agencies are needed—and it would be an evil if either should be abandoned. I have no idea of opposing a single Anti-Slavery party, without making a political plan, and having my way. That God for Garrison and for Horace Greeley, for Wendell Phillips and for Horace Mann—for the 17,000 subscribers of the *National Era*, for the 70,000 subscribers of the *Tribune*, and the 100,000 purchasers of Uncle Tom. I believe in Gerrit Smith and in Fred Douglass—in Anti-Slavery churches and in Anti-Slavery come-outs. But I do not believe in the attacks made on Horace Mann by Wendell Phillips, on Gerrit Smith by Garrison, and on Fred Douglass by the *Tribune* by the *Evening Star* on Fred Douglass by Stephen Foster, on the churches by Parker Pillsbury.

We want union among Anti-Slavery people of all colors and stripes. We want a basis of action where all can stand together, yet without losing their individual preferences or giving up their favorite methods. We wish to have an organization which will unite in a practical action Anti-Slavery Whigs and Anti-Slavery Democrats, and yet leave them, as before, Whigs and Democrats. We want a way of action on paper, without making another political party—a political action which shall not be party action. We wish to give a practical direction to moral effort, and a moral work to a practical and efficient combination. All these ends, I think, will be attained in the League, the plan of which I now proceed to state.

THE LEAGUE.

Sec. 1. The name of this association shall be, "The League of Freedom." It shall be to diffuse Anti-Slavery convictions by means of lectures and publications, and to organize these convictions in a practical and efficient course of action.

Sec. 2. All persons shall become members of this association by signing the pledge, and by subscribing not less than—annually to its funds.

Sec. 3. The pledge should be as follows:

We, whose names are subscribed, agree not to give our property for the support of any under the State of Federal Government, who do not, before the election, publicly show himself in favor of the following measures:

1. Repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.

2. Trial by jury to every person claimed as a fugitive from slavery.

3. Prohibition of slavery in the Territories, and abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

4. No new slave States to be admitted.

5. General Government to be relieved from all claim to the slaves.

Sec. 4. The League shall not nominate its own candidates, but shall before every election publish the names of these candidates, of either party, who have publicly agreed to act according to its principles.

Sec. 5. There may be Local Lodges of the League of Freedom, State Lodges, and a General Lodge. This last shall publish a newspaper, which shall be sent to every member who desires it, in return for his annual subscription. Subscriptions are appointed to the State Lodges, and these shall be lectures, social meetings, public festivals, and whatever else shall tend to bind together and increase the League.

THE WAY IT WILL WORK.

1. It will place all the *National Era* on the side of Freedom. Those that are not, the side of district, where parties are nearly balanced, 1,500 Whigs and Democrats should belong to the League. Both parties are then certain that to elect their candidate they must take one who agrees with the Leagues on these points. Sooner or later, they will all do so. So of Governor, so of State legislators, so finally of President.

2. It will furnish a bond of union and co-operation to genuine Anti-Slavery men of all parties.

The pledge is a no-vowing pledge, and therefore detaches no man from his party. The Whig is not asked to vote for a Democrat, nor the Democrat for a Whig. He is only pledged to abstain from voting when his own party candidate is an unfit one. Thus the Anti-Slavery element is not taken out of the Whig and Democratic parties, but is made efficient to bring both right.

3. It will put an end to political corruption among Anti-Slavery men.

As the League will nominate no candidates no ambitious office-seekers will have any motive to make themselves prominent in its movement. Nor can any charge of office-seeking be brought against its active members.

4. It will give a practical aim to moral effort.

The object to be accomplished is to get new signs of Anti-Slavery from new members to the League. But, in doing that, the whole subject of slavery and its evils, of freedom and humanity and justice, is opened up for moral and intellectual effort.

The above is a hasty sketch of the plan. Its details may have to be altered. But its main feature of a no-vowing pledge is the

essential thing, and by means of this a new movement may be commenced, which shall not cease till Slavery is rooted out of the land.

May I ask of the friends of Freedom to consider this plan, and to speak their minds concerning it?

For the *National Era*.

WHO SHALL WAIL?

Wail, oh Hungary, the bleeding!
Wail, oh fallen land!

Wail, oh mist, free mountains.
As徒 mourners stand!

Wail, oh mighty man, than Danube.
From this outraged flood;

Wail, oh like that of Abel
Of the hero-blood.

Wail, oh towers of conquered Buda,
Wave thy flags, Despair!

Let no voice, in Presburg's chambers,
Stir the dead air.

In the streets of Pest, fitst foal,
Breath, no echo sound.

Wail, oh blood like that of Abel
Cry from the ground!

Wail, wail, hawk of Austria,
In thine Alpine eyrie high;

There are thunders forged above thee,
And the cloud is nigh.

Wail, wail, Ural, despot;
Chain thy gods of Mystery!

From all thy yelling bloodhounds
From the mangled free!

Send wail from thy myriads,
Serp and Wallach, Scavle and Croat;

Struck ye not, like midnight murderers,
At your brother's throat?

Wail, from thy heart's not of treasons—
Light is on thee, why, Barley,

And thou last of traitors, Gurgey,

Wail! thou'rt a man!

Prophet-chief, for thy pale martyrs
Lift no wailing voice!

On the Hills of Light, thy victory
Dawn, and they rejoice.

Wailing for thee, Hayburgs,
Wailing for the dead.

Wailing for of slaves,
Sigh that morn is found.

Festive Hungary, arising,
Lift to the gods thy prayer;

But that heaven also thy opens,
And—her King is there!

Shoot! the pall of black oppression
Rolled from earth shall be;

For the Future of the nations,
God hath written—free!

MISS DIX'S BILL

To the Editor of the *National Era*:

This bill, which was defeated in the last Congress, is to be introduced again, and is to be proposed until this day two weeks. It is a laudable and praiseworthy idea in its conception; but is it practicable?

Can the donation of ten millions

of acres of public land to the thirty-one States,

proportion to their representation in Congress—three-fifths and all—be of any practicable utility?

To ascertain this, look at the

details of the bill.

The lands by it, cannot be sold for less than a certain price; for no State to come under the provisions of the bill until the State legislates that it will be done. We will suppose that it will be done.

What will be the cost of the bill?

What will be the amount of the bill?